



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,414	11/09/2001	Rick Korczak	7836/83306	2098

7590 12/05/2002

Mitchell J. Weinstein, Esq.  
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.  
22nd Floor  
120 S. Riverside Plaza  
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER

WEINHOLD, INGRID M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3632

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/046,414

Applicant(s)

KORCZAK ET AL.

Examiner

Ingrid M Weinhold

Art Unit

3632

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM  
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-140 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-140 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 7/17/02 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 1 1/2, 2, 5, 6 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Information Disclosure Statement***

A portion of the information disclosure statement filed 7/10/02 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but foreign patents 168882; 710034; 6912883 and 2417870 (the abstract translation submitted for this last patent was actually a translation for a different patent) have not been considered.

The information disclosure statement filed 3/8/02 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. There were no copies of the selected webpages from [www.unistrut.com](http://www.unistrut.com) that was listed in the PTO-1449. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

***Specification***

The disclosure is objected to because:

- 1) Page 2, paragraph 0006, lines 8-9, "U.S. Patent application Serial No. 09/430,496" should be changed to --U.S. Patent No. 6,354,543 B1-- since the application has issued as a patent.
- 2) Page 6, paragraph 0048, line 5, reference numeral "48" should be --46--.
- 3) Beginning in paragraph 0067 and continuing throughout more of the paragraphs, reference numeral "10" is being used to refer to the attachment surface but reference numeral has already been used for the rail adapter.
- 4) Page 13, paragraph 0067, line 6, the reference numeral "9" should be --90--.
- 5) Page 13, paragraph 0068, line 1, the term "the" needs to be replaced with the term --that--.
- 6) Page 19, paragraph 0090, line 2, the term "B" was previously used already to define a barb.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Drawings***

The formal drawings have been approved by the Draftsperson under 37 CFR 1.84 or 1.152.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: "54", "78a"

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: "112", "118", "120", "140", "146" in Figure 3 and "G" in Figure 25.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because in Figures 8 and 14, the hanger illustrated needs to have a new reference number or a prime since the hanger in Figure 2 was already assigned the numeral "52" and it shows a different embodiment of the hanger. Also, in Figure 28, regarding the reference numeral "B", this numeral was already disclosed in the specification to refer to a hanger barb, although it was not displayed in the drawing.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters "12" and "14" have both been used to designate the rail. In Figures 9-11 and 22, the rail is being referred to with the reference numeral "14" which was used to define the base of the rail. The correct reference numeral for the rail is --12--. Also, the reference numeral "10" has been used to designate the adapter illustrated in Figure 1, and it is again used in Figure 22 to designate stacked hangers.

A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 12 is objected to because the claim from which it is dependant from has been omitted from the claim.

Claim 33 is objected to because it depends from claim 34, which is not a preceding claim.

Claim 46 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Both claims claim "said provision comprises an opening adapted to be retentively engaged by an article support".

Claims 50 and 63 are objected to because the term "an" needs to be deleted.

Claims 82, 83, 90, 91 are objected to because the term --be-- needs to be inserted before the term "supported".

There were two claims numbered 126 so claims 126-139 (beginning with the second occurrence of claim 126) has been renumbered to 127-140.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-23, 27-34, 37, 47-72, 94, 95, 97-120, 122-126 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, and 14 the channel is not being claimed yet features are being definitively defined by the channel. For example, in claim 1, the hook like portions are being definitively defined by the channel in claiming "such that the hook like portions biasedly engage the rail lips". A feature that is only recited in the functional language cannot definitively define another feature. The intended use of the invention being used in combination with a channel has not been given patentable weight. The invention could be used with many other structures besides a channel.

Regarding claim 27 and 122, a provision is being claimed "for retaining the article on the channel", and the dependant claims further define the provision to be an opening. The provision, or opening, itself does not retain the article on the channel. The provision allows another hanger or connector to attach to the coupling. The "article" itself is supported by the coupling, but not by the opening so this claim is indefinite.

Regarding claim 32, this claim is dependant on claim 30, which defines an embodiment with a threaded opening. Claim 32 is defining a different embodiment so

Art Unit: 3632

cannot depend from claim 30 since it was not disclosed that the two embodiments could be combined.

Regarding claim 33 the claim states that the coupling, which the examiner is interpreting as the hanger, comprises an adapter for supporting an "article support". It is unclear if the "article support" is the coupling itself or if some other support is being supported.

Regarding claim 34, it is unclear once again what the "support" is referring to since the claim states that the support is stackable, and it is the hanger, or the coupling, itself that is stackable. Claim 24 and its dependant claims use the term "coupling" and if this is what the "support" is referring to then the same claim language should be used to avoid confusion.

Regarding claims 47 and 60, there is no antecedent basis for "the coupling". Examiner suggests using the same claim language throughout all of the claims to avoid confusion. Currently, applicant has used "article support" as well as "coupling" and this has lead to some indefinite claims. For example claims 56 and 69 use the terms "coupling" and "article support" in the same claim.

Regarding claim 94, there is no antecedent basis for "said support" since in this claim "coupling" was used. In claim 95, both "coupling" and "support" are used.

Regarding claim 97 there is no antecedent basis for "The apparatus". Dependant claims 98-100 also use the phrase "The apparatus".

Regarding claims 102 and 103, there is no antecedent basis for "The apparatus". Dependant claims 104-106 also use the phrase "The apparatus".



Regarding claim 107, there is no antecedent basis for "The apparatus".

Dependant claims 108-112 also use the phrase "The apparatus".

Regarding claims 114 and 116, there is no antecedent basis for "The apparatus".

Dependant claims 115 and 117 also use the phrase "The apparatus".

Regarding claim 118, there is no antecedent basis for "The apparatus".

Dependant claims 119-120 also use the phrase "The apparatus".

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-10, 14-17, 23-29, 33-51, 55-64, 68-97, 101-103, 107-109, 113-140 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-26, 28-38 of U.S. Patent No. 6,354,543 B1. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the structure of the hanger and the method of use is the same

Art Unit: 3632

in both the application and the patent. The structure of the hanger includes the legs, a mounting surface with an opening, barbed feet, spring fingers to retain the pipe or line and allow for different diameters, and resiliency to allow the legs to be squeezed together to insert the feet into the hole of another hanger or object. The hangers are also stackable.

Claims 1-10, 14-17, 23-29, 33-51, 55-64, 68-97, 101-103, 107-109, 113-140 directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-26, 28-38 of commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 6,354,543 B1. Specifically, both the application and the patent claim a flexible hanger with mounting legs and an opening on the mounting surface that allows two or more hangers to be stacked and the method to use the hanger.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP § 2302). Commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 6,354,543 B1, discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee is required under 37 CFR 1.78(c) and 35 U.S.C. 132 to either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made

Art Unit: 3632

or to name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter. Failure to comply with this requirement will result in a holding of abandonment of the application.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications filed on or after November 29, 1999.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

(f) he did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented.

Claims 1-10, 13-17, 20-29, 33-51, 55-64, 68-81, 84-89, 92-97, 101-103, 107-109, 113-140 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) because the applicant did not invent the claimed subject matter. All of the subject matter claimed in these claims was already disclosed and taught in the Patent by Paske (6,354,543 B1).

Art Unit: 3632

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10, 13-17, 20-29, 33-51, 55-64, 68-81, 84-89, 92-97, 101-103, 107-109, 113-140, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Paske (6,354,543 B1).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the

reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

Paske shows an adapter (10) comprising a mounting surface, flanges depending from the mounting surface, and opposed mounting legs with feet, the legs extending from the flanges, and the feet each having a hook-like portions (22) which prevent slippage, the adapter being flexible to permit urging the flanges inwardly toward one another and further being resilient. The mounting legs include an inwardly extending portion contiguous with a downwardly extending portion, and wherein the hook-like portion (22) is formed at an end of the downwardly extending portion. There is at least one binding element (projection tabs on either side of "14" and "16") formed on at least one of the mounting legs cooperating with each hook-like portion to clamp the object that it is mounted to between the hook-like portion and the binding element. The binding element is a tab disposed on the inwardly extending portion and is defined by a pair of notches in the inwardly extending portion. The tab includes a downwardly bent portion. Means for mounting include frictional means and an opening (108), formed on the mounting surface, which is a planar top surface. There is also a plurality of downwardly/inwardly oriented projections (114) included in the mounting means, which extend from a periphery of the opening. A different embodiment shows the mounting surface can also be curved as shown in Figure 10a. There are slots formed in the flanges (behind spring members "30"). An opening in the mounting surface allows other hangers or articles to be attached and allows stacking to permit a number of articles to

Art Unit: 3632

be daisy-chained. The adapter (10) supports an article between its legs, traverse to the legs, and is able to support articles of different diameters and different types. There are spring fingers ("29" and "30"), which allow for the different diameters. The feet (22) are configured so that the legs are automatically pinched when pushed into an opening and snap into the opening because of the legs resiliency. There are four legs with two legs positioned on each side of the article. Regarding claims 73-81, 84-89, and 92-93 the "support" and the "adapter" are virtually the same thing since the structures are similar and the claim language reads on the same structure for both. Since the adapter is stackable as shown in Figure 5 by Paske, the bottom hanger is the "adapter" and the upper hanger is the "support". Both are shown to be of a generally U-shaped resilient configuration. Vibrations of the held articles are dampened.

Claims 11, 12, 18, 19, 30, 31, 52, 53, 65, 66, 98, 99, 104-106, 110-112 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paske (6,354,543 B1) in view of Heath (5,344,108). Paske shows all features claimed by the applicant's invention but does not however show a collar with threads depending from the opening. Heath shows a circular opening on the top surface of a hanger, which comprises a threaded collar (34b). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the square opening by Paske with the circular opening with a threaded collar as taught by Heath in order to allow a different connector to be attached to the hanger that requires threading.

Claims 32, 54, 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paske (6,354,543 B1) in view of Andre (4,505,006). Paske shows all features

Art Unit: 3632

claimed by the applicant's invention but does not however show radial friction tabs.

Radial friction tabs are well known in the art to be used to grip an object and provide enough of a resiliency to hold it in place. Andre shows radial friction tabs (12) that hold an article in place. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included radial friction tabs as taught by Andre on the hanger by Paske in order to allow for a different type of connection.

Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 14-16, 20-28, 35-43, 47, 48, 58-62, 69-74, 82, 84-87, 89-95, 107, 121, 128, 129, 135-138, 140 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tsai (6,257,530 B1). Tsai shows an adapter (20) comprising a mounting surface, flanges depending from the mounting surface, and mounting legs extending from the flanges, the mounting legs each having a hook-like portion (24), the adapter being flexible to permit urging the flanges inwardly toward one another and further being resilient. The mounting legs include an inwardly extending portion contiguous with a downwardly extending portion, and wherein the hook-like portion (24) is formed at an end of the downwardly extending portion. There is at least one binding element (232) formed on at least one of the mounting legs cooperating with each hook-like portion to clamp the object that it is mounted to between the hook-like portion and the binding element. The binding element is a tab disposed on the inwardly extending portion and is defined by a pair of notches in the inwardly extending portion. The tab includes a downwardly bent portion. The mounting surface is a top surface, which is curved. The means for mounting include frictional means of the article displaced within the hanger

Art Unit: 3632

and include projections or spring fingers (235) integrally formed in the flanges, which create slots and the projections keep the article in place. The provision for holding an article is the space that is created between the legs, as well as the spring fingers, which combined support an article. The spring fingers allow articles of different diameters and types to be supported. The feet (24) are configured so that the legs are automatically pinched when pushed into an opening and snap into the opening because of the legs resiliency. There are four legs with two legs positioned on each side of the article and the article is supported transverse to the legs. An article support (10) is configured to connect to the adapter (20) and releasably engage the adapter with a snap action. The adapter and support are interconnected with a swivel joint permitting the articles to be supported at any angle with respect to the object the support is mounted to. Regarding claims 84-93, 135-138, and 140 the adapter (20) will be referred to as the article support, and the article support (10) will be referred to as the adapter. An adapter (10) is configured to be locked onto another object (80) and a resilient unitary article support (20) has opposed legs structured when pinched to releasably connect to the adapter (10) with a snap action. The adapter (10) has an opening (13) wherein the support (20) is adapted to lock into the opening. The opening is engaged by barbed feet (24). The support is configured to retain an article between its legs. The adapter and support are interconnected with a swivel joint permitting articles to be supported at any angle with respect to the object mounted upon (80). The adapter (10) is configured to retain an article between its legs, transverse to the legs.



Art Unit: 3632

Claims 9, 49, 113 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsai (6,257,530 B1) in view of Juds et al. (4,763,132). Tsai shows all features claimed by the applicant's invention but does not however show a planar mounting surface, or tabs configured to prevent slippage. Juds shows a planar mounting surface (26) and tabs (37) that bite into the object being mounted to (20). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included a planar mounting surface as taught by Juds in order to define a resilient hinge connection between the legs (column 3, lines 36-38), and have the tabs by Tsai bite into the object being mounted to as taught by Juds in order to restrict turning of the hanger once the hanger has been installed (column 4, lines 1-4).

Claims 1, 2, 7-9, 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kreinberg et al. (5,108,055). Kreinberg shows an adapter comprising a mounting surface (48), flanges depending from the mounting surface and mounting legs extending from the flanges, the mounting legs each having a hook-like portion (26), the adapter being flexible to permit urging the flanges inwardly toward one another. The mounting legs include an inwardly extending portion contiguous with a downwardly extending portion, wherein the hook-like portion is formed at an end of the downwardly extending portion. An opening (56) is formed in the mounting surface, which is the top, planar surface.

Art Unit: 3632

Claims 11, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kreinberg et al. (5,108,055) in view of Heath (5,344,108). Kreinberg shows all features claimed by the applicant's invention but does not however show a collar with threads depending from the opening. Heath shows an opening on the top surface of a hanger, which comprises a threaded collar (34b). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included a threaded collar as taught by Heath in order to strengthen and protect the opening taught by Kreinberg.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kreinberg et al. (5,108,055) in view of Andre (4,505,006). Kreinberg shows all features claimed by the applicant's invention but does not however show radial friction tabs. Radial friction tabs are well known in the art to be used to grip an object and provide enough of a resiliency to hold it in place. Andre shows radial friction tabs (12) that hold an article in place. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included radial friction tabs as taught by Andre on the hanger by Kreinberg in order to allow for a different type of connection.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claim 83 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 100 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ingrid Weinhold whose telephone number is (703)-306-5762.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leslie A. Braun can be reached on (703) 308-2156. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-3686 for informal documents, (703) 872-9326 for formal regular communication and (703) 872-9327 for After Final Communications.

Application/Control Number: 10/046,414  
Art Unit: 3632

Page 19

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.



Ingrid Weinhold  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 3600  
Art Unit 3632



LESLIE A. BRAUN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER